Applicants: Elsworth et al. Attorney's Docket No.: RTN-194AUS

- Serial No. : 10/773,125 : February 5, 2004 Filed

Page : 7 of 9

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 3, 5 to 7 and 19 to 30, are pending in this application; of which, claims 1 and 19 are the independent claims. Favorable reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Initially, Applicants thank the Examiner for conducting an interview on October 17, 2006. The Examiner indicated that amending the claims to include a "high strength" and/or "high modulus" fabric layer would overcome the prior art rejection. The Examiner further indicated that allowance would be dependent on an additional search and further consideration.

Claims 1 to 7 and 19 to 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Cain et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,673,611 referred hereinafter as "Cain") in view of Habib (U.S. Patent Number 4,144,027).

Amended claim 1 is directed to a fabric product. The fabric product includes a fabric layer which includes a plurality of high strength and high modulus fibers. The plurality of fibers is impregnated by an impregnation compound with the fabric layer coated on each side with the impregnation compound. The impregnation compound is derived from a mixture including a pre-polymer, a co-reactant curative and a diluent. The diluent solvates the mixture of the prepolymer and the curative. The impregnation compound has a curative stoichiometry range of less than 85 percent.

Applicants: Elsworth et al. Attorney's Docket No.: RTN-194AUS

• Serial No. : 10/773,125

Filed: February 5, 2004

Page : 8 of 9

The applied art is not understood to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of claim 1. In particular, neither Cain nor Habib disclose or suggest that the fabric product has a plurality of high strength and high modulus fibers.

Cain discloses fabrics to make clothes and in particular hats (see Abstract of Cain).

However, does not disclose or suggest that the fabrics are of a high strength or a high modulus.

Therefore, Cain does not disclose or suggest that the fabric product has a plurality of high strength and high modulus fibers.

Habib is directed keratin fibers (see Abstract of Habib). Keratin fibers do not have a high strength nor a high modulus. Therefore, Habib does not disclose or suggest that the fabric product has a plurality of high strength and high modulus fibers.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons indicated above, even if Cain were combined with Habib, the resulting hypothetical combination would not disclose or suggest that the fabric product has a plurality of high strength and high modulus fibers. For at least this reason, Applicant request withdrawal of the cited references.

Claim 19 is a system claim having corresponding features to claim 1. Applicants submit the Cain and Habib references should also be withdrawn with respect to claim 19 for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Applicants submit that all dependent claims now depend on allowable independent claims.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants request withdrawal of the art rejection.

Applicants: Elsworth et al. Attorney's Docket No.: RTN-194AUS

Serial No. : 10/773,125

Filed: February 5, 2004

Page : 9 of 9

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or

concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above

may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for withdrawing the prior art cited with regards to

any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this

paper should be construed as intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as

specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify

concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicants submit that the entire application is now in condition for allowance. Such

action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

All correspondence should be directed to the address below. Applicants' attorney can be

reached by telephone at (781) 401-9988 ext. 23.

No fee is believed to be due for this Response; however, if any fees are due, please apply

such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0845 referencing Attorney Docket: RTN-194AUS.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 24 October 2006

Anthony T. Moosey
Reg. No. 55,773

Daly, Crowley, Mofford & Durkee, LLP 354A Turnpike Street - Suite 301A Canton, MA 02021-2714

Telephone: (781) 401-9988 ext. 23

Facsimile: (781) 401-9966